



* * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * *

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNINGGENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: August 22, 2001 Staff Member: Christina D. Tran
Thomas Guide: 637 C-D 6 USGS Quad: El Monte
Location: 12200 block of East Pellissier Road

Description of Project: Application for a CUP to construct an industrial park consisting of four buildings (two in County) with 198 parking spaces. Building #3 will be 50,368 s.f. with five units ranging from 9,167 to 11,691 s.f. to be used for warehouse purposes only. Building #4 will be 89,437 s.f. with four units ranging from 13,855 to 35,207 s.f. to be used for warehouse and manufacturing purposes (i.e., light computer assembly). It is estimated that approximately 180 employees will be working at the project site for one shift between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.. Access to the site will be through Peck Road, Rooks Road, and the non-residential portion of Kella Ave. Adjacent lots located within the City of Industry will be developed with two industrial buildings totaling 135,450 s.f.

Gross Acres: 6.7 acres

Environmental Setting: Project site is flat and located in a developed area with no significant vegetation or animal habitat. The site is currently utilized as a truck and trailer stop as well as an industrial and office uses. Structures at the site also include an electric tower, a faix building water well, a service garage, and a storage shed. The shed and garage will be demolished to pave way for the proposed project. Surrounding uses consist of single family residences, commercial/industrial uses, vacant lots, utility lines, the San Gabriel River, a church, and a nursery. The adjacent lots located within the City of Industry will be developed with two industrial buildings totaling 135,450 s.f.

Zoning: MPD (Manufacturing Planned Development)

General Plan: Low Density Residential

Community/Area wide Plan: N/A

Major projects in area:

<u>PROJECT NUMBER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION & STATUS</u>
<i>CP00115</i>	<i>1.5 million s.f. industrial park (Pending)</i>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

<u>Responsible Agencies</u> <input type="checkbox"/> None <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Water Quality Control Board <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles Region <input type="checkbox"/> Lahontan Region <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission <input type="checkbox"/> Army Corps of Engineers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Caltrans</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <hr/> <u>Trustee Agencies</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <hr/> <input type="checkbox"/> State Fish and Game <input type="checkbox"/> State Parks <hr/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Special Reviewing Agencies</u> <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy <input type="checkbox"/> National Parks <input type="checkbox"/> National Forest <input type="checkbox"/> Edwards Air Force Base <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>City of South El Monte</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>City of Industry</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>City of Whittier</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <hr/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <hr/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Regional Significance</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> SCAG Criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns. Area <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <hr/> <u>County Reviewing Agencies</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision Committee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DPW: <i>Geology & Soil, Drainage & Grading, Traffic & Lighting, Environmental Programs</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire Department <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health Department: <i>Environmental Hygiene, Environmental Health, Solid Waste Management Program</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	--

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)			
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact		
			Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		
				Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg			Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Liquefaction</i>
	2. Flood	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Drainage concept</i>
	3. Fire	7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Noise	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sensitive receptors</i>
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Use BMP, NPDES</i>
	2. Air Quality	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Biota	11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Circulation</i>
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Education	18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Utilities	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Solid Waste</i>
OTHER	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Land Use	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Noise, traffic</i>

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

- Development Policy Map Designation: Conservation / Maintenance
- ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
- ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

- ☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)
EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

- ☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

- ☒ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

- ☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as “significant”.

- ☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? <i>Liquefaction, Whittier Heights Fault</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? <i>Liquefaction</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

<input type="checkbox"/> Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MITIGATION MEASURES	<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	
<input type="checkbox"/> Lot Size	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Design	<input type="checkbox"/> Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

DPW concluded that project will not have significant impacts in their letter dated 12/4/01. Detailed liquefaction analysis required at grading/building plan stages.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than significant with project mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than significant/No Impact
--	---	--

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? <i>Located next to San Gabriel River</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? <i>Project may change surface flow patterns</i>

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

Drainage concept and SUSMP approved by DPW on 7/15/02. Applicant shall comply with all conditions contained in approved plan.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation

☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Prevention Guide No.46
☐ Fuel Modification / Landscape Plan

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Applicant shall comply with all conditions and recommendations set forth by the County Fire Department in their letter dated 11/9/01.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be

impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?
				<u>Industries</u>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?
				<u>Delivery trucks, loading and unloading associated with warehouse operations</u>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
				<u>Delivery trucks, loading and unloading associated with warehouse operations</u>
e.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?
				<u>Proposed industrial development is adjacent to residential areas</u>

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Health Department concluded that project will not have significant impacts in their letter dated 11/16/01.

Construct sound wall; no outdoor public address system and no outdoor mechanical trash compacter.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be

adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation

☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations <i>or</i> is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? <i>Parking lots with 25 or more parking spaces are subject to NPDES requirements</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? <i>Parking lots with 25 or more parking spaces are subject to NPDES requirements</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPDES Permit CAS614001 Compliance (DPW) |

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES

- ☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Best Management Practice for post construction

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation

☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
<hr/>				
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Near SEA #42 – Whittier Narrows Dam Recreation Area</i> Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
<hr/>				
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site?
<hr/>				
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?
<hr/>				
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?
<hr/>				
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?
<hr/>				
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?
<hr/>				
<hr/>				

<input type="checkbox"/> MITIGATION MEASURES	<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
<input type="checkbox"/> Lot Size <input type="checkbox"/> Project Design	<input type="checkbox"/> ERB/SEATAC Review <input type="checkbox"/> Oak Tree Permit

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially significant	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than significant with project mitigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than significant/No impact
--	--	---

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Next to San Gabriel River</u> Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

Disturbed site

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?
<hr/>				
<hr/>				

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? <i>San Gabriel River Trail</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?
<hr/>				
<hr/>				

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Visual Report

☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation

☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? <i>Access may be inadequate</i>
e.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded? <i>Industrial Park will be over 100,000 s.f.</i>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☒ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

DPW concluded that proposed project will not have significant impacts in their letter dated 3/18/02. Applicant shall comply with all conditions and recommendations set forth in said letter.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation

☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES – 3. Education

N/A

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create student transportation problems?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Site Dedication ☐ Government Code Section 65995 ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☒ Fire Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? <i>Solid waste limitation</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Conversation with Betty Morrison of the Solid Waste Mgmt. Section of Health Dept. on 12/26/01 who stated that they typically comment on transfer station, composting, etc. projects. Recycling program required.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
i.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>Overhead power lines run across a portion of the project site. Site also previously had underground storage tanks which have been properly closed.</i>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Consultation with Environmental Health, call with Kathleen Kaufman on 1/3/02 of the Radiation Management Section who stated that the Health Dept. does not review power lines.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hillside Management Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project physically divide an established community?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☒ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.</p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> <p><i>Noise, traffic</i></p>

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☐ Less than significant/No impact